

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheet makes changes to Fig. 3 and replaces the original sheet with Fig. 3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5 and 7-10 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 7 and 9, Figure 3 and the specification are amended. No new matter is added by these amendments. Claims 4 and 6 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiners Getaneh and Le during the personal interview held December 10, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

The Office Action objects to the drawings for informalities. Fig. 3 has been amended to include the label (28-3) in order to obviate the objection. Additionally, the specification has been amended in the paragraph starting on page 17, line 2 to recite a first printing program 50 in order to obviate the rejection to Fig. 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

The Office Action objects to the specification for informalities. The specification has been amended to obviate the objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

The Office Action rejects claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §101 for failing to claim statutory subject matter. Claim 9 has been amended to obviate the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0170973 to Teraura. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Office Action asserts that Teraura teaches all the features recited in independent claims 1, 3, 7 and 9. However, Teraura does not teach an image forming system including at least "a parameter writing unit for writing one of the read first parameter and a second parameter containing a history updated in response to the image formation on the recording medium into a storage unit of the recording medium, wherein the history contained in the second parameter includes at least a size change of the image formed on the recording medium," as recited in claim 1 and similarly in claims 3, 7 and 9.

The Office Action asserts that Teraura, in paragraphs [0087], [0088] and [0111], teaches a history updated in response to the image formation on the recording medium into a storage unit of the recording medium. Teraura, in paragraphs [0087] and [0088], teaches whether permission data is included in the data read from the RFID tag 14 in the sheet of document papers 61. Additionally, Teraura, in paragraph [0111], teaches that digital data can be recorded in the RFID tag 14 attached to the paper. However, Teraura does not teach two separate parameters with the second parameter containing a history updated in response to the image formation on the recording medium.

Therefore, Teraura, does not teach "a parameter writing unit for writing one of the read first parameter and a second parameter containing a history updated in response to the image formation on the recording medium into a storage unit of the recording medium, wherein the history contained in the second parameter includes at least a size change of the image formed on the recording medium," as recited in claims 1, 3, 7 and 9.

For at least the reasons above, Teraura cannot reasonably be considered to teach, nor would have suggested, the combinations of all the features recited in at least independent claims 1, 3, 7 and 9. Further, claims 2, 5, 8 and 10 would also not have been suggested by the applied references for at least the respective dependencies of these claims on allowable

independent claims 1, 3, 7 and 9, respectively, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3, 5 and 7-10 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Tiffany J. Brooks
Registration No. 57,912

JAO:TJB/rle

Attachment:
Replacement Sheet

Date: January 29, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--